

REMARKS

I. Introduction

The Examiner argues that Suzuki discloses all of the limitations of claim 2, with the exception of the cable being a coaxial cable (which, *per* currently amended claim 2, is no longer a limitation). Applicants submit that additional limitations of currently amended claim 2 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Suzuki. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the references relied upon by the Examiner, alone or in combination, cannot anticipate or render obvious currently amended claim 2.

II. Suzuki does not Disclose or Suggest a “dielectric member made from a porous resin material”

Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki does not disclose or suggest the “dielectric member” as described in claim 2. Claim 2 requires that the “structure for connecting an electrical connector to a cable” comprise a “dielectric member made from a porous resin material.” The Examiner asserts that the “dielectric member” is allegedly disclosed by the “joining sheets 51.” (*See* Office Action, p. 4).

Currently amended claim 2 requires that the “dielectric member” be composed of a “porous resin material” such as polytetrafluoroethylene foam. (*See* ¶ [0021]). Suzuki discloses a “low-permittivity dielectric connector 11” with a “dielectric sheet of stretched porous polytetrafluoroethylene resin (hereinafter referred to as E-PTFE) 21” with “a pair of corrugated joining sheets 51, 51 of polytetrafluoroethylene (hereinafter referred to as PTFE).” (*See* Suzuki, Col. 3, lines 49-64). Thus, the joining sheets 51, which the Examiner cites as allegedly disclosing the “dielectric member,” are composed of PTFE and not the porous E-PTFE as is the

“low permittivity dielectric connector 11.” The PTFE that comprises the joining sheets 51, on the other hand, is not a “porous resin material” – hence the openings 71 on the connector 11. Thus, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest a “dielectric member” composed of a “porous resin material” as required by claim 2. For at least this reason, Suzuki does not anticipate claim 2.

III. Suzuki does not Disclose or Suggest an “electro-magnetic shielding core sheath”

In order to clarify the invention further, Applicants have amended claim 2 to require that the core sheath of the cable core shield the core conductor from electro-magnetic radiation. Such cable sheaths are well known in the art. Although Suzuki discloses a low-permittivity connector 11 for connecting to a flat cable 9 having a plurality of rigid plated wires 104 that are sandwiched between *a pair* of PTFE tapes 114 (*See* Suzuki, Col. 4, lines 56-64, FIG. 4), Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki does not disclose claims 2’s limitation of “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a cable, said cable including cable cores each having a core conductor and *an electro-magnetic shielding core sheath*” (emphasis added).

Applicants cite at least two differences in this regard. First, the PTFE tapes, in contrast to the “cable sheath” of the pending application, provide no electro-magnetic shielding functionality as required by claim 2. The PTFE tapes are used for insulating and not shielding purposes. Moreover, the PTFE tapes cannot even arguably comprise a “sheath” as they are merely a pair of sheets with more than one wire sandwiched between them. A “sheath” on the other hand is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as a “tube-like case, covering, or protection.” One skilled in the art of wire connectors would understand a “sheath” comprise a tube-like casing that surrounds a single wire – a “sheath” is not a pair of sheets with a plurality of wires sandwiched in between. As such, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest a structure for

connecting to a cable including cable cores, each cable core having a core conductor and an electro-magnetic shielding core sheath. For at least this additional reason, Suzuki does not disclose every limitation of claim 2 and thus cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 2.

IV. Suzuki does not Disclose or Suggest a “dielectric member containing an air-filled cavity housing at least part of the exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable”

Claim 2 has been further amended to more clearly define the “dielectric member.” Per amended claim 2, the “dielectric member” must contain “an air-filled cavity housing at least part of the exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable.” Suzuki, on the other hand, discloses “wires 104 . . . inserted straight, and without losing linearity, into the openings 71 of the housing 61.” (See Office Action, p. 4 (citing *Suzuki*, Col. 5, lines 16-18)). In contrast to the pending application where all of the exposed portions of the cable cores are in a single air-filled cavity, Suzuki discloses an individual opening 71 for each wire. Thus, each opening appears to be a self-contained entity. Suzuki fails to disclose or suggest the “exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable” housed in an “air-filled cavity.” For at least this additional reason, Suzuki does not disclose every limitation of claim 2 and thus cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 2.

Daane has been cited against claim 2 only for the teaching of the limitation of a “structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable.” (Office Action, page 5). Daane does not disclose or suggest any of the aforementioned features of independent claim 2 missing from Suzuki and has not been so cited. Thus, claim 2 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Suzuki and Daane. Applicants further respectfully submit that, since claims 5-9, 11 and 12 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 2, and so contain all of its limitation, these

dependent claims cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully solicit the allowance of the pending claims. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. Applicants are aware of no fees due with this submission. If any fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account Number 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Ragusa
PTO Reg. No. 38,587
(212) 408-2588

David Loretto
PTO Reg. No. 44,374
(212) 408-2584

Attorneys for Applicants
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112